

# **THE BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION**



**2012**

## **PRIORITIES REPORT**

**Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (Board)**

*The mission of the Board is to lead California in developing policies and programs that serve the public interest in environmentally, economically, and socially sustainable management of forest and rangelands and a fire protection system that protects and serves the people of the state.*

The California State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (Board) is a Governor-appointed body within the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Department). Members are appointed on the basis of their professional and educational qualification and their general knowledge or interest in problems that relate to watershed management, forest management, fish and wildlife, range improvement, forest economics, or land use policy. Of its nine members, five are chosen from the general public, three are chosen from the forest products industry, and one member is from the range-livestock industry.

The Board is responsible for developing the general forest policy of the State, for determining the guidance policies of the Department, and for representing the State's interest in Federal land in California. Together, the Board and the Department work to carry out the California Legislature's mandate to protect and enhance the State's unique forest and wildland resources.

The strategic planning process defines and communicates the Board's guiding values and priorities. This planning directs resources and efforts on the most important issues. It also defines both the Board's and Department's desired future outcomes, and how performance is measured and reported. This reporting, in turn, provides for an improvement cycle that allows the Board and the Department to make informed and timely changes.

The process begins with the development of the Fire and Resource Assessment Program's (FRAP) thorough evaluation of the state's wildlands. This evaluation included participation and input by affected stakeholders and the public.

After the Assessment is completed, the Board develops the framework for its mandatory policy statement or Strategic Plan. The Board utilizes a framework that allows for ongoing evaluation of current status and the ability to adapt strategies after that evaluation. The framework clearly describes the mission and goals of the organization.

The Strategic Plan is only one step in a process that will lead to further development of specific work plans, refinement of the indices that will define progress, and ongoing adaptation through a public process to ensure that the Board's vision is achieved.

To assure accountability, it is necessary to conduct annual evaluations. These evaluations will serve two purposes:

- Demonstrate what the Board and Department have been able to accomplish toward attainment of their goals
- Allow for the public to provide input on the direction of the Board and Department.

Through this process, it is the desire of the Board to achieve its vision and provide a methodology for accountability.

For the purpose of focusing on particular issues the Board in the past, and until mid year of 2011, was broken down into four standing committees. Each committee had at least three members. The four committees were: Legislation and Policy, Management, Forest Practices, and Resource Protection.

- The mission of the Management Committee is to evaluate and promote long-term, landscape level planning approaches to support natural resource management on California's non-federal forest and rangelands, and to evaluate State Forest management plans.
- The mission of the Legislation and Policy Committee is to evaluate and promote policy and legislation for the guidance of the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and to represent the state's interest in federal and non-federal forest and rangelands.
- The mission of the Resource Protection Committee is to evaluate and promote an effective fire protection system implemented by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and improve forest and rangeland health in California.
- The mission of the Forest Practice Committee is to evaluate and promote an effective regulatory system to assure the continuous growing and harvesting of commercial forests and to protect soil, air, fish and wildland, and water resources.

Lack of staffing forced the Board to re-evaluate the need for four committees. To achieve greater efficiency in time management and staff assignments, the Board now utilizes two standing committees. They are Resource Protection and Forest Practice. The Management committee has been subsumed into Forest practice, and Policy issues are to be considered by the Board as a whole.

To assist the Board in specific matters, standing committees can be appointed. One example is the Monitoring Study Group. The Monitoring Study Group's monitoring program provides timely information on the implementation and effectiveness of forest practices related to water quality that can be used by forest managers, agencies, and the public in California to improve water quality protection

When a committee is deemed necessary, members may be appointed by the chairman of the Board and may be drawn from specializations applicable to the committee's concerns. As an example, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was a Board appointed committee of renowned scientists and agency representatives that provided oversight on a literature review of scientific articles related to forest management effects on anadromous salmonids.

Various laws also establish committees to advise the Board in particular areas. Examples are the Professional Foresters Examining Committee, which advises the Board on implementations of the Professional Foresters Licensing Law; and the Range

---

Management Advisory Committee, which advises the Board on range and livestock issues.

Committees of the Board

**COMMITTEES REQUIRED BY STATUTE**

1. Range Management Advisory Committee
2. Professional Foresters Examining Committee
3. Soquel Advisory Committee

**INTERNAL STANDING COMMITTEES**

1. Forest Practice
2. Resource Protection

**EXTERNAL STANDING COMMITTEES**

1. Research and Science Committee
2. Monitoring Study Group
3. California Oak Mortality Task Force
4. Interagency Forest Working Group
5. Jackson Advisory Group
6. Committee on Criminal Trespass

**Resource Protection Committee (RPC)**

*The mission of the RPC is to evaluate and promote an effective fire protection system implemented by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and improve forest and rangeland health in California.*

**COMPLETED OR SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETED 2011****1. Update of State Responsibility Area Maps**

**Objective:** Pursuant to Public Resources Code § 4125-4128, the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection shall classify all lands in the State for the purposes of determining areas in which the financial responsibility of preventing and suppressing wildfire is primarily the responsibility of the State. These lands are termed State Responsibility Area (SRA). The maps depicting these lands are updated, according to statute, every five years.

**Status:** Completed

**2. Utility Vegetation Clearing Standards**

**Objective:** Track CALFIRE Monitoring of performance of major woody stem exemption; review CPUC on new vegetation clearing standards and adopt permanent clearing regulation.

**Status:** On December 6, 2011, the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection adopted amendments to the Fire Prevention Standards for Electrical Utility in Title 14 CCR, Division 1.5, Chapter 7 Fire Protection, and Article 4. The regulation provides an exemption to the utility vegetation clearing requirements in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 1257(a)(3), and defines the term "Hazard Tree" in Section 1257(b). The exemption allows for healthy, mature trees (trunks and limbs commonly referred to as "Major Woody Stems" or identified by the acronym "MWS"), sufficiently rigid so they do not present a risk to public safety, to be closer to powerlines than the minimum clearing distance under existing regulations..

**3. Regulatory consistency with new PRC 4291 laws:**

**Objective:** Revise 14 CCR 1299.

**Status:** CAL FIRE submitted initial draft amendments to 1299 to RPC in December 2010. Hearing is scheduled for March 2012. The purpose of this regulation is to provide guidance for implementing the defensible space criteria of PRC 4291 (a) and (b) and minimize the spread of fire within a 100 foot zone around a building or structure.

---

**4. Sudden Oak Death Regulations:**

**Objective:** Board adopted emergency regulations for treatment and developed permanent disease control regulation.

**Status:** Hearing is scheduled for March 2012. The proposed rule defines an Emergency Condition under Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 1052.1 and specifies the location, treatments, and environmental protection measures related to the removal of live and dead hardwood trees or vegetation infected by or susceptible to Sudden Oak Death disease. The proposed regulation allows for filing of an Emergency Notice instead of a Timber Harvesting Plan when operations are conducted in accordance with the proposed rule conditions of Section 1052.5, Emergency Notice for Outbreaks of Sudden Oak Death Disease.

**5. Forest Legacy Program Procedures, 2011.**

**Objective:** Develop regulations for the Forest Legacy Program

**Status:** On April 6, 2011, the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection adopted a regulation required by the California Forest Legacy Program Act of 2000, as contained in Section 12200-12292 of the Public Resources Code. The statutes and regulations establish a program for securing conservation easements for private forest lands. The adopted regulations establish parameters and disclosure requirements for a parcel's eligibility for the program, eligible costs, documentation requirements, project ranking criteria, and program responsibility of the Department and landowner necessary for acquiring the conservation easement.

**6. Update of Title 14 CCR 1270 Regulations (Fire Safe), PRC 4290/4291.**

**Objective:** Revise SRA Fire Safe regulations.

**Status:** Staff has completed proposed amendments to administrative portions of the regulations. Hearing is scheduled for February 2012. This regulation makes several revisions to the existing regulations for the purpose of improving regulatory clarity and uniform implementation of wildfire protection standards association with residential subdivision development.

**PRIORITY 1:****1. Section 4210, et seq. of the Public Resources Code imposes an annual "State Responsibility Area Fire Prevention Fee."**

**Objective:** Develop regulations to make specific AB X1 29, Chapter 741, Statutes of 2011.

**Status:** The Board adopted emergency regulations to begin the implementation of this statute at the end of 2011. This fee is to be paid by individual owners of habitable structures located on lands that lie within a designated State

---

Responsibility Area (SRA). The Board designates SRA boundaries pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 4102. SRA lands roughly correspond to areas that are covered in timber and other vegetation, or contiguous rangelands, which provide watershed value. They do not include areas within federal ownership or within incorporated cities. The Board plans for several public hearings at various locations throughout the State in the first half of 2012, leading to the adoption of a permanent regulation by mid year.

**2. Update of Title 14 CCR 1270 Regulations (Fire Safe), PRC 4290/4291.**

**Objective:** *Revise SRA Fire Safe regulations. These regulations provide wildfire protection standards association with residential subdivision development.*

**Status:** Begin review of possible amendments to Articles 2, 3, and 4 in 2012. Form Departmental group to inform process.

**3. Vegetation treatment plan EIR.**

**Objective:** *In 2005 the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (Board) initiated preparation of an updated Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the Vegetation Management Program administered by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Department). The original 1981 PEIR applied only to the use of prescribed fire on private land within state fire protection responsibility areas. It became clear that implementation of an effective vegetation management program to reduce the risk of large damaging wildfires would need to cover a wider range of land ownerships and utilize a wider range of tools for vegetation treatment than prescribed fire. The Board adopted a new California Fire Plan in 1996 that relied on expansion of vegetation management treatments (land and tools) to reduce the large wildfire risk. The Department then prepared and certified a revised PEIR for vegetation management in 2000. The PEIR was subsequently decertified 2002 as directed by a superior court decision. The court found that the use of herbicides for vegetation treatment was not adequately addressed in the PEIR.*

*In 2005 SB 1804 broadened the range of vegetation treatment practices described in Public Resources Code. The Board then began work on preparation of the current PEIR which does cover a wider range of vegetation treatments and broader range of land ownerships (non-federal public lands). With this change the title of the PEIR was changed to the Vegetation Treatment Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (VTPEIR). Scoping sessions for this effort were conducted in August of 2005 and work began on preparation of a Draft EIR, but was delayed due to staffing and funding constraints. Since that time the Board adopted a new 2010 California Fire Plan which is risk based.*

**Status:** Administrative draft for review in March/April 2012. Complete EIR 2012.

---

**PRIORITY 2:****4. Goldspotted Oak Borer**

**Objective:** Goldspotted oak borer (GSOB) is an invasive pest contributing to the on-going oak tree mortality occurring on federal, state, private, and local Native American lands in San Diego County. On going updates being provided by various agencies, primarily by COMTF.

**Status:** RPC to consider drafting a policy statement and GSOB Zone of Infestation regulation or other actions to address issues. Ongoing review in 2012.

**5. California Fire Plan**

**Objective:** Review on-going implementation of final Plan adopted in June 2010.

**Status:** quarterly reports being received.

**6. Safety Element Review (all counties, cities with VHFHSZ)**

**Objective:** Review ongoing general plans submitted.

**Status:** Submission of GP recommendations to counties ongoing.

**PRIORITY 3:****7. Nursery Program Review**

**Objective:** Begin review of Board Policies in light of current budget and Magalia closure, ramifications for climate change adaptation strategy.

**Status:** No timelines or work progress established.

**8. Fuel Hazard Reduction Emergency and Forest Fire Prevention Exemption (14 CCR §§ 895.1, 1052, 1052.1, 1052.4, 1038(e), and 1038(i))**

**Objective:** Rules allow fire-prone landscapes in fire-critical areas to be treated to lessen their fire threat. Consider provisions to assure that such landscapes will be maintained.

**Status:** No timelines or work progress established.



**Forest Practice Committee (FPC) (note: includes former Management Committee issues)**

*The mission of the FPC is to evaluate and promote an effective regulatory system to assure the continuous growing and harvesting of commercial forests and to protect soil, air, fish and wildland, and water resources.*

**COMPLETED OR SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETED 2011****1. Aspen, Meadow and Wet Area Restoration, 2011**

**Objective:** Review regulatory interpretations of 14 CCR 939.15 on opening size allowed for this method; needs clarification.

**Status:** Completed field trip to review issue in 2010. Board adopted regulation in August 2011. The regulation developed a new silvicultural "Special Prescription" that states the requirements for projects that harvest, remove or otherwise treat commercial conifer trees in aspen stands, meadow or wet areas for purposes of restoring habitat, ecological and range values. The regulation eliminated regulatory constraints associated with even-age silvicultural rules allowing a wider range of projects designs.

**2. (D09 #4)14 CCR § 913.11(a) [933.11(a), 953.11(a)] Maximum Sustained Production**

**Objective:** Board should consider forming a technical working group to consider changes to existing MSP rule to provide more concrete standards for the MSP demonstration per 14 CCR § 913.11(a) [933.11(a), 953.11(a)]. Consider implications for assuring AB 32 targets.

**Status:** Committee reviewed February of 2011 and found no further action necessary.

**3. (D09 #12) Modified THP for fuel reduction**

**Objective:** Establish a new type of Modified Timber Harvesting Plan, called the Modified Timber Harvesting Plan for Fuel Hazard Reduction.

**Status:** On June 8, 2011, the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection adopted a new harvesting plan permit that provides standards and requirements for removal and commercialization of forest products for purposes of fire hazard reduction. It is intended to encourage forest landowners to consistently manage their fuel loads for long term resiliency to the impacts of fire and provide an efficient permit that is less costly to prepare and implement compared to a conventional Timber Harvesting Plan.

---

**4. Regulatory amendments for permanent T/I rules: Road rules**

**Objective:** Consideration of regulatory recommendations made by the interagency road rules committee in October 2007, as well as other possible modifications.

**Status:** Set for hearing in April 2012. Staff has begun field trips to examine on the ground implementation.

**5. Hours of Work, Hours of Operation, and Log Hauling Exception, 2010:**

**Objective:** In response to a petition received on May 20, 2010, pursuant to Government Code 11340.6., take regulatory action to permit timber operations on the nationally observed Columbus Day holiday. The petition pertains to all counties which contain county Forest Practice Rules adopted by the Board pursuant to PRC 4516.5 including Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Mateo, Lake, Marin, and Monterey.

**Status:** On March 2, 2011, the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection adopted a regulation amending sections in the rules to effectuate the petition.

**PRIORITY 1:****1. Regulatory amendments for permanent T/I rules: Road rules**

**Objective:** Same as above.

**Status:** Same as above.

**2. Review of Class II-L Watercourses definition and Requirements**

**Objective:** Review definition and application of prescriptive requirements for Class II –L watercourses.

**Status:** Review begun in January 2012. Consideration of objective standards for Class II-L

**PRIORITY 2:****3. Regulatory amendments for permanent T/I rules: Cumulative Effects (14 CCR 916.9 (d)).**

**Objective:** Review of current status of cumulative effects process

**Status:** FPC began work January 2012.

**4. Regulatory amendments for permanent T/I rules: Monitoring. (14 CCR 916.11)**

**Objective/Status:** FPC to begin work following completion of T/I road rules. Estimated beginning in 2012. To be delegated for initial review to MSG.

**5. Development of pilot programs for SERM/ Option v projects**

**Objective/Status:** Department has formed a Technical Advisory Committee (VTAC) to develop and provide advice on pilot programs to implement option (v) projects under the Anadromous salmonid Protection Rules (ASP).

**6. Consistency of NSO rules with USFWS guidance**

**Objective/Status:** FPC to begin work following completion of T/I road rules. Estimated beginning in 2012.

**7. Long term stability and management**

**Objective:** Consider the following items:

- Increase NTMP acreage (cuts burden of repetitive THP processing)
  - Create a separate but complimentary rule package that provides incentives for community owned forests, properties with some portion of the ownership covered by conservation easements, and or non- industrial landowners who own more than 2,500 acres (5,000, 7500, 10,000?) of timberland whereby other public benefits are provided such as public access, recorded conservation easements, agreement to maintain higher than regional average stocking levels and restrictions on harvest within stream buffers.
- Fuel reduction projects that allow log sales as cost-defraying incentives
- Changes to the Modified THP to increase utility and reduce costs
- Promote PTEIR cooperatives for regional/watershed groups (Mattole Restoration Council, Fire Safe Councils)
- Expand use of PTEIR/SYP
- Use private forest certification concepts to reduce costs and regulatory oversight

**Status:** Significant progress has occurred on these issues. PTEIR guidelines were developed by the Board to streamline the review process, a fuel hazard reduction THP was adopted, SYP renewal rules were adopted, and discussions were begun on NTMP acreage.

**PRIORITY 3:****8. Site Index for major Young-Growth Forest Woodland Species in Northern California: Discussion of update to 14 CCR 1060 Site Classification.**

**Objective/Status:** FPC completed initial review of topic in April-June of 2010. FPC deferred additional work until road rules are completed.

**9. 14 CCR § 913.4(d) Variable retention rules do not specify reentry period for leave areas. Minimum age of application is the same as even age regeneration?**

**Objective/Status:** no progress to date.

**10. Department disallows use of the Transition silviculture method when applied to stands which have been previously harvested utilizing the**

---

**Selection method.** Does not conform with 14CCR § 913.2(b) or (b)(2). Past harvest history should not be a condition of the application of any silvicultural prescription. THP was returned on this issue without being evaluated through PHI to support the determination. **Objective/Status: no progress to date.**

11. **Stocking levels:** too high for some forest types. **Objective/Status: no progress to date.**
12. **Should mechanical feller-bunchers be classified as "heavy equipment" in WLPZs?** **Objective/Status: no progress to date.**
13. **14CCR § 1038(c)(3) Slash removal interpretation:** does the slash need to be removed from the subject property, rather than from within the actual timber operation? **Objective/Status: no progress to date.**
14. **14 CCR § 914 [934, 954]** Tractors shall not be used in areas designated for cable yarding except to pull trees away from streams.....Such exception (s) shall be explained and justified....Suggest replacing language to allow usage subject to the limitations of 14 CCR § 914 [934, 954].2 (f)- prohibitions on steep slopes. **Objective/Status: no progress to date.**
15. **(D09 # 7)14 CCR § 916.9(s) [936.9(s), 956.9(s)]** [in part], No timber operations are allowed in a WLPZ, or within any ELZ or EEZ designated for watercourse or lake protection, under exemption notices except for... **Objective/Status: no progress to date.** Should be considered in the context of 14 CCR § 1104.1(a)(2)(F), which allows conversion activities in the WLPZ where specifically approved by local permit. Defer to the county in these situations? Restriction of timber operations in the WLPZ affects timber operations conducted in compliance with defensible space regulations. There appears to be a conflict between this subdivision and PRC § 4291 and 14 CCR § 1299. **Objective/Status: no progress to date.**
16. **Progeny Sites:** These sites are usually planted over a long period of time 3-10 year period to get various age classes and seed sources. Some of the land may sit fallow for a number of years and not meet a 5 year stocking requirement. Exempt up to 40 acres from meeting the required stocking standard if the property owner designates that area for a progeny plantation. **Objective/Status: no progress to date.**
17. **Issues related to THP form and content**  
**Objective:** Complete revisions to THP form and address the below issues:  
**Status:** CAL FIRE has draft revision.  
  
**(Restating FPRs in THPs:** Consider allowing the statement of compliance with specific rule section (s) by number, rather than using language out of the FPRs. New THP form under development, will be addressed. **Objective/Status: no progress to date.**  
  
**D09 #5)14 CCR § 916.4(c)(1) [936.4(c)(1), 956.4(c)(1)]** [in part], The location of the areas of heavy equipment use in any ELZ shall be clearly described in the plan, or flagged or marked on the ground before the preharvest inspection. **14**

**CCR § 1034(x)(7)**, [On a plan map, show the location of all watercourse crossings of classified watercourses except temporary crossings of Class III watercourses without flowing water during timber operations at that crossing.] 14 CCR § 916.4(c)(1) [936.4(c)(1), 956.4(c)(1)] requires RPF to clearly describe, flag or otherwise identify ELZ on the ground prior to the pre-harvest inspection. 14 CCR § 1034(x)(7) requires the RPF to map the location of all classified watercourse crossings except temporary dry Class III crossings. CAL FIRE recommends the Board amend the rules to delete the allowance in 14 CCR § 1034(x)(7). **Objective/Status: no progress to date.**

**(D09 #10)14 CCR § 1034, Contents of Plan.** **Objective/Status: no progress to date.**

**(r)**, How the requirements of 14 CCR 1032.7(f) are to be met. *The reference to 1032.7(f) is obsolete, since it refers to the past requirement that the RPF distribute and publish a copy of the NOI.*

**(x)(7)**, [On a plan map, show the location of all watercourse crossings of classified watercourses except temporary crossings of Class III watercourses without flowing water during timber operations at that crossing.] (See above)

**(x)(9)**, [On a plan map, show the location of all watercourses with Class I, II, III, or IV waters.] *This paragraph should be amended to add "and lakes."*

**(ii)**, On a map complying with subsection 1034(x), the locations and classifications of roads, watercourse crossings, and landings to be abandoned shall be shown. *This subdivision should be deleted and the mapping requirement should be incorporated as part of 14 CCR §1034(x), which applies strictly to mapping.*

*Board should consider amending 14 CCR § 1034 when it adopts or amends any rule that adds elements considered a required portion of a harvesting plan. This ensures a central location where the RPF could be assured of finding what is considered essential information in a harvesting document. Board may want to consider a rule package that consolidates all required plan contents under 14 CCR §§ 1034, 1051, 1090.5, and 1092.09.*

**(D09 # 9)14 CCR § 1032.7(d)** [in part], A Notice of Intent [NOI] shall include the following information: (4) the acres proposed to be harvested. (5) The regeneration methods and intermediate treatments to be used.

**Objective/Status: no progress to date.**

*(4) Board should amend this paragraph to include all acres where timber operations will occur, not just the area where timber will be harvested. In doing so, the Board should consider the current definition of logging area and the lack of a definition of plan area.*

*(5) Requires stating the regeneration methods and intermediate treatments to be used. This paragraph may not capture all possible treatments that may occur, e.g., special prescriptions and other types of associated timber harvesting, such as road right-of-way or timberland conversion.*

---

**(D09 # 9)14 CCR § 1032.10**, The THP submitter shall provide notice by letter to all other landowners within 1,000 feet downstream of the THP boundary whose ownership adjoins or includes a Class I, II, or IV watercourse(s) which receives surface drainage from the proposed timber operations. The notice shall ....

**Status: no progress to date.**

*Overland flow or channel flow?*

*Publication may need to be given in a newspaper of general circulation. CAL FIRE assumes this requires notification as defined in Government Code §§ 6000-6027.*

*A tie should be made with the requirement to provide protection to domestic water supplies, as required per 14 CCR § 916.10 [936.10, 956.10].*

*Require more current notification in which the post-marked date is no more than one year prior to submittal of the plan.*

*Does a plan have to be returned where the RPF requests an exemption from one of the noticing requirements and CAL FIRE does not accept the request.*

*The rule requires at least ten days passing after notification before submission of the plan.*

*The 4<sup>th</sup> sentence should be changed to use the proper verb, "affect," in place of "effect."*

**Full Board (includes actions of Policy Committee, 2011)**

*The mission of the Policy Committee is to evaluate and promote policy and legislation for the guidance of the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and to represent the state's interest in federal and non-federal forest and rangelands.*

**COMPLETED OR SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETED 2011****1. Recirculation and Review of Plan by Director, 2011**

**Objective:** *Develop regulations that allow for CEQA and the Forest Practice Act to supplement each other and be harmonized (Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. Arcata Nat. Corp. (1976) 59 Cal.App.3d 959, 965 (NRDC).), and allow for reorganization of procedures into efficient groupings.*

**Status:** The regulation adopted September 14, 2011 adds to 14 CCR § 895.1 the definition of "Significant New Information" consistent with CEQA. It also removes from 14 CCR § 898.1 the review procedure for Significant New Information, and places it in Sections 1037.3 (THPs), 1090.17 (NTMPs), and 1092.18 (PHTPs) so that all review procedures for each harvesting document are in one location, rather than separate ones.

**2. Special Conditions Requiring Disapproval of Plans**

**Objective:** *The amendment requires the Director to disapprove a plan that would result in adverse slope stability impacts that could affect the health and safety of the public when supported by a review from the California Geological Survey.*

**Status:** The State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection adopted a regulation on March 2, 2011, that requires the Director to disapprove a plan that would result in adverse slope stability impacts that could affect the health and safety of the public when supported by a review from the California Geological Survey.

**3. Battle Creek**

**Objective:** *Staff from the Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) Review Team agencies formed the interagency Battle Creek Task Force (Task Force). The Task Force performed a rapid assessment to determine if timber operations associated with SPI clearcut harvesting in Battle Creek had resulted in observable erosion and subsequent delivery of sediment which has resulted in violation of state law or observable negative impact to fisheries. Overall, the Task Force saw no significant direct water quality impact related to clearcut harvesting in the assessment area. Most observed timber-harvest-related water-quality impacts were found to be associated with publicly and privately managed roads.*

---

**Status:** The results from the assessment allowed the Task Force to make several recommendations regarding forest-related land use activities in the Battle Creek watershed. The Board is currently reviewing those recommendations.

**PRIORITY 1:**

**1. Board/State Policy Statement- refinement of metrics.**

**Objective:** *Assessment completed in 2010. Board approved strategic direction. Board to develop policy statement and development of metrics for adopted strategies.*

**Status:** No current progress

**2. Review of All Board Policies.**

**Objective:** *All Board Policies should be reviewed and, if necessary, revised and re-adopted. Estimated time lines are for an ongoing two year review.*

**Status:** Staff has begun initial review.

**3. Water Quality joint policy statement**

**Objective:** *Develop policy statement to allow for a uniform waiver process.*

**Status:** Staff has begun working on a “strawman” for discussion. EO and Chair met with senior management at WQ to discuss process for integrating review and joint policy. Further discussions on hold pending CAL FIRE appeal of NCWQCB waiver order. Monitor USFS waiver discussions for application to possible State process.

**4. Hardwood Policy Review:**

**Objective:** *Review policies and programs related to Hardwoods, begin possible revision and review of DFG joint policy.*

**Status:** No current actions

**5. Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands Stewardship Council**

**Objective:** *Board approved Department effort to acquire lands in the Stewardship Council planning units of “Pit River,” “Battle Creek,” “Cow Creek,” “Burney Gardens,” “Lake Spaulding,” “Bear River,” “North Fork Mokelumne River,” and “Lyons Reservoir” that would be suitable for inclusion in the Department’s Demonstration. Board must approve management plans for these acquisitions when final.*

**Status:** Pending

**6. Jackson Demonstration State Forest:**



**Objective:** *Continued review management at Jackson*

**Status:** Board has continued to liaison with the Jackson Advisory Committee (JAG). Interim period has concluded, and recommendations received from JAG. Board adopted these recommendations with some modifications.

7. **Soquel:** *Updated Management Plan under development.*

**Objective:** *Management Plan Update and CEQA coverage to be completed by 2012. Liaison with Soquel Advisory Group.*

**Status:** Management Plan Update to be finalized in 2012. Board approved continued management under existing plan. Next meeting April 2, 2012

**PRIORITY 2:**

8. **Other issues:**

*County and Local Government Outreach  
Education Program  
Legislative Review  
Federal Policy issues  
Timber Tax Liaison*

9. **(D09 #13)14 CCR § 1054.8, Order of the Board,** *The process and timelines described in this rule section are not consistent with the process and timelines outlined in PRC § 4582.7(d) and 14 CCR § 1037.6 regarding disapproval of the plan by the Board and the provision for bringing the plan into conformance. Neither this section nor PRC § 4582.7(d) are consistent with CEQA and current case law regarding re-circulation of plans with significant new information. The Board should consider amending this rule section to make it consistent with statute and code regarding the current plan review process and timelines.*
10. **(D08) 14 CCR § 929.2(a)(1)** *Archeological records checks and survey process are redundant in some cases. Could this system be revised go reduce costs and duplication?*

**PRIORITY 3:**

11. **(D07) 14 CCR § 916.8 [936.8, 956.8].** *Due to the lack of use of this rule section and to adequate provisions contained in current laws and regulations, CAL FIRE recommends the Board delete this rule.*
12. **(P07) 14 CCR § 919.4** *Rare plant lists and mitigations. Should the Board develop rules for addressing non listed species?*
13. **(P07) WHR definition for late successional forest.** *WHR is a DFG program. Board Rules reference it but not by date or version. Changes to WHR could change meaning of rules.*

- 
- 14. (P07) 14 CCR §1039.1:** *Allow an approved plan to be extended any time during the year that it will expire.*

**PROCESS ISSUES, UNPRIORITIZED**

- Assure that in-person Review Team meetings take place
- Allow public participation in PHIs if no other Review Team meeting is to take place
- Assure that public that has expressed interest is welcomed to and invited to participate in Review Team meetings taking place by telephone
- Make all review team correspondence readily available in a timely manner on the internet
  - One reviewing office/nexus for harvest permits(policy committee)
  - Right to practice forestry (similar to right-to-farm ordinances) (policy committee)
  - Performance-based BMPs as an explicit alternative to prescriptives in the Forest Practice Rules (policy committee)
  - Maximize awareness of the beneficial elements of timber harvesting on greenhouse gas emissions (policy committee)
  - Promote forest harvests as a way to boost rural economy/local jobs
  - Increase the life of THPs for low impact operations
  - Reduce application and review costs for low impact THPs and/or fuel reduction projects
  - Exempt low impact harvests from heavy THP review

---

## **Non-Substantive Rule Issues (section 100)**

### **1. 14 CCR § 895.1 - Erosion Hazard Rating**

The Rules state in part:

**14 CCR § 895.1** (For the Coast and Southern Forest District:) means the rating derived from the procedure specified in 14 CCR 912.5 (952.5) designed to evaluate the susceptibility of the soil within a given location to erosion. **Erosion Potential:** (For the Southern Forest District:) See 14 CCR 952.5 (Ref. Sec. 4562 PRC). **Estimated Erosion Potential** (For the Northern Forest District:) means the product of the soil and slope values derived from the table in 14 CCR 932.5 or as such product may be modified in accordance "with the instructions contained in that section" (Ref. Sec. 4562, PRC). **Substantial Deviation means...**[in part]...**(4)**

Change in location, nature or increase in length of proposed logging roads incorporating one or more of the following criteria: **(B)** Any road located in an extreme Erosion Hazard Rating area in the Coast Forest District, extreme Estimated Erosion Potential area in the Northern Forest District, or a high Erosion Potential area in the Southern Forest District.

**14 CCR § 1092.26(d)** Change in location, nature or increase in length of proposed logging roads incorporating one or more of the following criteria: **(2)** Any road located in an extreme Erosion Hazard Rating area in the Coast Forest District, extreme Estimated Erosion Potential area in the Northern Forest District, or a high Erosion Potential area in the Southern Forest District.

The term, erosion hazard rating (EHR), is used in Rule sections requiring an RPF to estimate the EHR per the procedure contained in Board Technical Rule Addendum #1, and in various other places in the Rules (Technical Rule Addendum No. 2, 14 CCR §§ 914.2(f) [934.2(f), 954.2(f)], 914.2(j) [934.2(j), 954.2(j)], 914.6(c) [934.6(c), 954.6(c)], 914.7(b) [934.7(b), 954.7(b)], 921.5(a), 926.8(h), 1034(x)(8), 1035(d)(2)(C), 1035(f), 1037.10(a)(8), 1051(a)(4), 1090.5(w)(8), 1090.7(n)(8), 1090.14(b)(4)(B), 1092.09(l)(9), and 1092.11(d)(2)(C)). Erosion potential and estimated erosion potential are terms that were not deleted when a portion of the Rules pertaining to estimating erosion potential was changed in 1982. These terms were referenced in the body of the Rules that were repealed at that time, but were not removed from 14 CCR § 895.1. The Board should delete them from 14 CCR § 895.1 and make appropriate changes to subparagraph (B) in the definition of substantial deviation in 14 CCR § 895.1 and paragraph (2) in 14 CCR § 1092.26(d) to make the use of the term, erosion hazard rating, consistent throughout the Rules and in each of the three forest districts.

### **2. 14 CCR § 895.1 - Fire Protection Zone**

The Rules state in part:

(For the Coast and the Southern Forest District:) means that portion of the logging area within 100 feet (30.48 m) as measured along the surface of the ground, from the edge of the traveled surface of all public roads and

---

railroads; and within 200 feet (60.96 m) as measured along the surface of the ground, from permanently located structures currently maintained for human habitation. **Fire Protection Zone** (For the Northern Forest District:) means that portion of the logging area within 100 ft. (30.48 m), as measured along the surface of the ground, from the edge of the traveled surface of all public roads and railroads, and 50 ft. (15.24 m) as measured along the surface of the ground from the traveled surface of all private roads, and within 100 ft. (30.48 m), as measured along the surface of the ground, from permanently located structures currently maintained for human habitation (Ref. Sec. [4562], PRC).

The definition, fire protection zone, was deleted from the hazard reduction Rules in 1991. At that time, CAL FIRE alerted the Board that it should eliminate the definition:

It is recommended that the definitions, “fire protection zone” and “lopping[.]” found in 14 CCR 912, 932, and 952 be repealed because either they are not used in the hazard reduction rules or they have been changed by the proposed rules.

To which the Board replied:

The Board agrees that the definitions[,] “fire protection zone” and “lopping[.]” have not been used or have been changed by the proposed rules. Accordingly, the definitions for these terms will be repealed or changed in accordance with those set forth in the proposed regulations for the sake of consistency.

The Board has never repealed the definition of fire protection zone. It should do so in order to resolve this matter.

### **3. 14 CCR § 914.1(d) [934.1(d), 954.1(d)] – Incorrect Rule Reference**

The Rules state in part:

Felling practices shall conform to requirements of 914.4, 934.4, 954.4 to protect bird nesting sites.

Under 14 CCR § 914.1(d) [934.1(d), 954.1(d)], the Rule language references 14 CCR § 914.4 [934.4, 954.4], which does not exist. The correct reference appears to be 14 CCR § 919.2 [939.2, 959.2]. The Board should change this Rule section to reference the correct Rule.

### **4. 14 CCR § 916.9(b) [936.9(b), 956.9(b)] – Cumulative Effects**

The Rules state in part:

Pre-plan adverse cumulative watershed effects on the populations and habitat of anadromous salmonids shall be considered. The plan shall specifically acknowledge or refute that such effects exist. When the proposed timber operations, in combination with any identified pre-plan watershed effects, will add to significant adverse existing cumulative

---

watershed effects, the plan shall set forth measures to effectively reduce such effects.

Given that this subdivision requires the RPF to specifically acknowledge or refute whether pre-plan adverse cumulative watershed effects on the populations and habitat of anadromous salmonids exist and to consider them; CAL FIRE believes that portion of this subdivision should be moved to 14 CCR § 912.9 [932.9, 952.9] or Board Technical Rule Addendum No. 2.

#### **5. 14 CCR § 926.3(d) – Incorrect Rule Reference**

The Rules state in part:

The plan submitter shall have the Notice of Intent published in a newspaper of general circulation in the area, concurrently with the submission of the plan to the Director. Proof of publication of notice shall be provided to the Director prior to his/her determination made pursuant to 14 CCR 1037.6.

The reference to 14 CCR § 1037.6 appears to be incorrect, since 1037.6 describes what to do when a plan does not conform to the Rules of the Board. The subdivision should likely refer to 14 CCR § 1037.4. The Board should amend this subdivision to refer to 14 CCR § 1037.4.

#### **6. 14 CCR § 1100 – Incorrect Code References**

The Rules state in part:

**(e)** "Compatible Use" compatible use as defined in Gov. C. 51100 (h) and 51111, as made specific by county or city ordinance adopted pursuant thereto (Ref.: Sec. 51100 (h) and 51111, Gov. C.).

**(f)** "Contiguous" two or more parcels of land that are adjoining or neighboring or are sufficiently near to each other, as determined by the County Board of Supervisors or City Council, that they are manageable as a single forest unit (Ref.: Section 51100 (b), Government Code.)

**(m)** "Timberland" timberland as defined in PRC 4526, for land outside a TPZ. Timberland as defined in Gov. C. 51100(f), for land within a timberland production zone (Ref.: Sec. 4526, PRC; Sec. 51100(f), Gov. C.).

There are several incorrect code sections quoted herein:

- Under "Compatible Use," the reference to Government Code (GC) § 51100(h) should likely be to GC § 51104(h).
- Under "Contiguous," the reference to GC § 51100(b) should likely be to GC § 51104(b).
- Under "Timberland," the reference to GC § 51100(f) should likely be to GC § 51104(f).

**Range Management Advisory Committee**

*RMAC was statutorily created to advise the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection, the Resources Agency, the California Environmental Protection Agency, and the California Department of Food and Agriculture on rangeland resources.*

Due to budget constraints and lack of staffing, RMAC suspended second half operations.

**PRIORITIES 2012****PRIORITY 1:****1. Strategic Fire Plan**

- a. Ensure implementation follows the goals and objectives.
- b. Monitor metrics for department assessment.

**2. Vegetation Management Program (VMP):**

- a. Monitor CAL FIRE review (currently suspended).
- b. Encourage CAL FIRE consideration of VMP review completed by RMAC on 6/28/05.
- c. Encourage implementation of the VMP.

**3. Vegetation Treatment Program Environmental Impact Report (VTP EIR):**

- a. Monitor development process (administrative draft being finalized).
- b. Review and provide additional comment on administrative drafts as necessary.

**4. Communication and Collaboration**

- a. Participate in Board of Forestry and Fire Protection Resource Protection Committee Meetings.
- b. Invite constituents, agency representatives, stakeholders, and issue experts to focus group meetings for information sharing as issues arise.

**5. Maintain involvement in the portions of the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection's actions directed at rangeland, and make recommendations to the Board as appropriate**

- a. Continue communications with board staff
- b. Attend Board committee meetings as issues apply

**6. Develop Williamson Act/Open Space Subvention Act position paper**

- a. Summarize findings from discussion

- 
- b. Determine how RMAC can be most effective and move in that direction

**7. Create Management Protocols for state-owned lands based on RMAC's Natural Resources White Paper**

- a. Work with public land holder to develop a site-specific management plan
- b. Distribute to all state agencies with rangeland ownership.

**8. Promote an effective CRM program and encourage expanded Range Management Bachelor of Science programs**

- a. Work with Cal-Pac SRM to clarify requirements and follow –up on previous inquiries
- b. Work with SRM to track continuing education requirements
- c. Offer support to existing and developing programs

**9. Gather and promote use of pragmatic invasive species control practices, including use of livestock grazing, to agencies and landowners**

- a. Identify gaps in invasive species management programs and find appropriate solutions
- b. Review Weed Management Area grant proposals
- c. Investigate distribution of Targeted Grazing handbook to CDFA and Weed Management Areas

**10. Stay informed on climate change and carbon sequestration as they relate to rangelands, and identify opportunities and benefits for landowners**

- a. Send at least one RMAC member to any related symposiums, meetings, etc. around the state
- b. Report back to entire RMAC any new developments

**Professional Foresters Examining Committee**

*PFEC shall protect the public interest through the regulation of those individuals who are licensed to practice the profession of forestry, and whose activities have an impact upon the ecology of forested landscapes and the quality of the forest environment, within the State of California.*

**MEMBERS**

Chair: Doug Ferrier  
Vice-Chair: Otto van Emmerik  
Gerald Jensen  
Raymond Flynn  
Kimberly Rodrigues  
Tom Osipowich  
William Frost

**PRIORITIES 2012****Statutory and Regulatory Obligations**

1. Two examination offerings annually.
2. Review, revision and approval of draft RPF examinations.
3. Qualification of applicants for RPF examinations.
4. Review and certification of examination results for Board approval.
5. Timely processing of licensing complaints for PFEC review and development of disciplinary recommendations for possible action by the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection.
6. Consistent Board appointments of Committee Members.
7. Committee meetings convened at least quarterly.
8. Assistance with function of specialty certificate program (CRM).
9. Continued participation in the annual CLFA Examination Preparation Seminar.

**Additional Priorities for 2012**

1. Contracting for new RPF examination questions.
2. Review of CRM Program Guidelines and recommendation for Board action.
3. Conduct outreach to other related professional groups and societies on subject of possible legislative proposal for amendments to Professional Foresters Law.
4. Conduct outreach to Board, professional associations and societies, and the general public for the purpose of building stronger working relationships with these entities.
5. Conduct educational outreach projects that support university and college forestry programs and students; consider outreach to primary schools for the purpose of encouraging high school students to consider forestry as a career choice.
6. Special projects as directed by the Board.



**Research and Science Committee**

*RSC was established the Research and Science Committee to provide science-based recommendations and technical information to assist the Board in determining if and when it is necessary or advisable to adjust rules and policies for forest and fire management to achieve resource goals and objectives. It will also advise the Board on research needs, priorities, policy, and such other matters as the Board directs (PRC §4789.6).*

**PRIORITIES 2012****Strategies as Identified in Board's Strategic Plan (5-1-07)****1. Biological Diversity**

- B. Strengthen analysis of cumulative impacts of land uses on terrestrial and aquatic habitat.
- C. Improve mapping and monitoring technologies and systems.
- D. Strengthen collaboration between regulatory agencies, the public, and the industry in addressing fish, wildlife, and native plant habitat concerns.
- G. Develop focused research program on State Forests for fish, wildlife, and native plant habitat.

**2. Productive Capacity**

- J. Support for continued assessments and research on the capability of California's forests to produce timber, non-wood forest products, recreation, water, fish and wildlife habitat, and other forest values.

**3. Forest Health**

- C. Develop monitoring and reporting systems for legislative reporting requirements.
- K. Develop overall plan to guide forest and rangeland pest research and control, including public involvement.
- L. Expand research on control methods.
- T. Maintain periodic assessments of impacts of ozone and other pollutants on forest and rangeland vegetation and aquatic resources.
- U. Develop improved modeling of air quality impacts of wild and prescribed fire.

**4. Soil Conservation and Water**

A. Continue support for watershed assessments using common watershed models and risk assessment capacity, enhancing cooperative mapping and monitoring techniques, and using long-term plans for large scale analysis and monitoring schemes.

B. Continue monitoring, especially to link in-stream conditions to hillslope processes. Incorporate in-stream monitoring technologies to track effectiveness of regulations and restoration efforts, and provide the basis for adaptive management.

F. Use the Demonstration State Forests as a venue for testing and demonstrating watershed assessment approaches and restoration techniques.

G. Conduct focused research on the dynamics of fish populations and their linkages to instream conditions and land uses.

H. Validate forest practice regulations as appropriate water quality protection measures.

## **5. Forest and Climate**

D. Refine carbon sequestration accounting and carbon trading mechanisms. Encourage systems that recognize all life stages of forests and forest products.

F. Develop a contingency plan for ecological impacts of climate change, including seed banks and land trades adjusted to ranges of vegetation types.

## **6. Socio-Economic Well Being**

U. Strengthen monitoring and adaptive management approaches for individual parcels as well as larger landscapes.

## **7. Governance**

F. Focus on achieving agreement on desired landscape goals and then address potential practices and conflicts.

G. Evaluate performance based rules structures to replace existing prescriptive standards as a means to encourage innovative approaches to resource management.

M. Develop overall forest and rangeland research plan for California.

P. Continue to hold research symposia to share results.

R. Develop and support a science review team that will provide the Board with timely review of existing rules, and, where appropriate, recommendations for modification of rules and evaluation procedures.

- Development of a Department data base of peer-reviewed science on topics of importance in THPs. Also, institute a requirement that the Department explain why legitimate science entered into the record in public comment is being ignored or rejected, as well as an explanation of why science submitted by plan proponent is being accepted with discussion of related studies not being referenced by proponent. If necessary, develop a scientific panel, agreed upon by all major stakeholders, to determine the legitimacy of the Department's assessment of the science.

**Monitoring Study Group**

*The Monitoring Study Group's monitoring program will provide timely information on the implementation and effectiveness of forest practices related to water quality that can be used by forest managers, agencies, and the public in California to improve water quality protection.*

**PRIORITIES 2012**

1. **Provide timely and professionally sound advice to the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection, or as directed, to a BOF-appointed science review team, on subjects related to water quality, soil erosion, and watershed conditions.**
2. **Provide guidance for programs testing the effectiveness of California's Forest Practice Rules related to water quality protection, which may lead to the development of a monitoring program that will fulfill U.S. EPA requirements for certification of the California Forest Practice Rules as Best Management Practices (BMPs).** Additionally, these programs are being developed to provide feedback for adaptive management and verify that the California Forest Practice Rules are adequately protecting water quality. Examples of these types of programs include, but are not limited to:
  - a. Developing a Phase II Modified Completion Report monitoring program using California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) Forest Practice Inspectors to evaluate implementation and effectiveness of the California Forest Practice Rules related to water quality for randomly selected plans (THPs, NTMPs, PTEIR PTHPs, etc.).
  - b. Developing and implementing the Interagency Mitigation Monitoring Program (IMMP) involving the Review Team agencies (CDF, CGS, DFG, and the Regional Water Boards) to collect data on the implementation and effectiveness of key plan components affecting water quality. The IMMP emphasizes evaluation of high risk sites (i.e., non-random selection) and evaluation of additional mitigation measures and special plan requirements related to protection of water quality.
  - c. Formation of an Effectiveness Monitoring Committee (EMC) to assist in pilot projects for ASP rules, and an adaptive management process. Committee on "hold" to allow for VTAC committee operations. **Status: Pending, resources allocated for VTAC**
3. **Provide an open public forum for:**
  - a. presentation of progress and final reports related to water quality monitoring efforts
  - b. discussion of monitoring projects being conducted by CDF, state and federal agencies, the timber industry, universities, and others in a collegial, unthreatening atmosphere where ideas and information are easily shared.

- 
- 4. Coordinate efforts between state and federal agencies involved in monitoring the water quality effects of forest management to avoid duplication and increase public confidence.**
  - 5. Provide a forum for coordinating support for existing and new cooperative instream watershed monitoring projects located in non-federal forested watersheds throughout California.** Current examples of watersheds with cooperative instream monitoring projects include:
    - (1) Caspar Creek, (2) Garcia River, (3) South Fork Wages Creek, (4) Judd Creek, and (5) Little Creek. These projects provide linkages between onsite monitoring and in-channel conditions, and will complement the onsite monitoring efforts listed in item (2) above.
  - 6. Provide advice regarding appropriate data analyses for past, current, and future state-sponsored monitoring programs related to water quality** (including, but not limited to the Hillslope Monitoring Program, Modified Completion Report Monitoring Program, and the Interagency Mitigation Monitoring Program). Results are to be reported when sufficient data analysis and summary has occurred.
  - 7. Provide timely information about finished and on-going monitoring projects to the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection** through monthly updates and a yearly summary presentation (to be presented at the end of the calendar year). Also, provide information on finished and on-going monitoring projects to state and federal agencies, Registered Professional Foresters (RPFs), Licensed Timber Operators (LTOs), watershed groups, local government, and the public through a variety of information dissemination mechanisms (e.g., MSG website, newsletters, Mass Mailings, workshop presentations, conferences, etc.)
  - 8. Facilitate use of results generated from monitoring projects in training programs for resource professionals throughout the state to improve water quality protection.**

**Forest Pest Council**

*The California Forest Pest Council (CFPC) aims to foster education concerning forest pests and forest health, and advises the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection on forest health protection.*

**Officers**

Chair: Bob Rynearson, W.M. Beaty & Associates  
Vice Chair: Tim Collins, Sierra Pacific Industries-Tahoe District  
Secretary: Kim Camilli, California Dept of Forestry and Fire Protection  
Treasurer: Steve Jones  
Conference Committee Chair: Katie Palmieri, COMTF/UC Berkeley  
At-Large Directors:  
Susan Frankel USDA-Forest Service, PSW Research Station  
Brent Oblinger USDA Forest Service  
Martin MacKenzie USDA Forest Service

**Committees**

CFPC is made up of several working committees that focus on various areas of scientific interest. The council also has established 3 special task forces that focus on the following special forest pest issues:

**Animal Damage Committee**

Chair Gregory A. Giusti, University of California Cooperative Extension

**Disease Committee**

Chair: Tom Smith, CAL FIRE  
Secretary: Patricia Maloney, Department of Plant Pathology, UC Davis

**Insect Committee**

Chair: Danny Cluck, U.S. Forest Service  
Secretary: Beverly Bulaon, USDA Forest Service

**Weed Committee**

Chair: Patricia Raggio, Delta Levee Habitat Improvement Program  
Secretary: Mark Gray, Sierra Pacific Industries

**Southern California Committee**

Chair: Kim Camilli, CA Dept. of Forestry & Fire Prevention  
Chair Elect: Tom Coleman, USDA Forest Service  
Secretary Vacant

**Editorial committee**

Chair: Tom Smith, CAL FIRE  
Editor in Chief: Lisa Fischer USDA Forest Service

**Oak Mortality Task Force**

Chair: Mark Stanley  
Website: [www.suddenoakdeath.org](http://www.suddenoakdeath.org)

**Pitch Canker Task Force**

Chair: Wally Mark

Website: [http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/pitch\\_canker/task\\_force/index.html](http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/pitch_canker/task_force/index.html)

**Firewood Task Force**

Chair: Don Owen

Website: [www.firewood.ca.gov](http://www.firewood.ca.gov)

**California Oak Mortality Task Force**

*COMTF's primary purpose is to coordinate research, management, monitoring, education, and public policy efforts addressing elevated levels of oak mortality in California resulting from Sudden Oak Death (SOD).*

**PRIORITIES 2012**

1. Minimize the impact and spread of *Phytophthora ramorum* on natural, agricultural, and human communities.
2. Coordinate an integrated response by all interested parties to address *Phytophthora ramorum*.
3. Serve as liaison to local, state, national, and international groups.



**Interagency Forestry Working Group (IFWG)**

*The purpose of the committee is to provide recommendations and technical information to assist the Board in achieving the Board's goals and objectives as outlined in the Board's report to the Air Resources Board on AB32 and in relation to the climate adaptation strategies as referenced in EO-13-08..*

1. **Develop and fund activities to reduce the uncertainty in existing State GHG inventory data related to all forests and rangelands including urban forests, and increase the State's capacity to collect, manage and create projections with thin information over the long-term including an assessment of the impacts from climate change on forest lands.**

**Objective:** *Provide input to BOF on policy implications, responsibilities and resources for improving forest GHG inventory based on inventory workshop to review methodologies and stakeholder comments. Need to develop a more comprehensive inventory of forestry carbon stocks and GHG inventory to more fully address emissions identified in current inventory (eg from domestic and imported wood products) and others that should be included (eg urban forests). Improve methodologies, as needed, for specific emission sources that currently lack precision, eg wildfires, land conversion.*

**Status:** Board to receive update, February 2012.

2. **Determine the effect of the State's existing forest and rangeland regulations (i.e., Sustained Yield Plans, Non Timber Management Plans, etc.) on meeting the state's GHG goals, whether simple adjustments are needed, or whether more significant action is needed.**

**Objective:** *Provide input/recommend approach to BOF for reviewing the carbon implications of existing, proposed and potential regulations.*

**Status:** Board to receive final report February 2012.

3. **Define sustainable woody biomass utilization for the Low Carbon Fuel Standard being developed by ARB and CEC, and assist in developing and/or identifying a project that could be funded with AB 118 funding in cooperation with CEC.**

**Objective:** *Provide report to IFWG.*

**Status:** Board to receive update February or March 2012.

**Committee on Criminal Trespass**

*The purpose of the committee is the examination of policies and practices toward illegal drug growing in California's forest.*

**Priorities 2012**

1. What is the role of local sheriffs and state and federal agents on private forest lands with regard to the control of illegal drug production?
2. What resources are available to public land management agencies to address eradication efforts?
3. How can the legacy infrastructure from eradicated gardens be effectively destroyed in order to increase the difficulty of growing repeatedly in the same location?
4. Can public land policies addressing transportation of growing equipment across public lands be changed to interdict equipment and supplies being used by illegal growers?
5. Can we effect a paradigm shift in local communities who feel that the loss of timber and fishing jobs "justifies" the need to grow Cannabis?
6. How can we change the attitude of professional foresters and others who work in our forests who have turned a blind eye to the illegal growing of marijuana in California forests?
7. How can we increase the support for local enforcement officers in their efforts to combat the problem?
8. Is it possible to regulate the sale of greenhouse and irrigation supplies when these supplies are thought to be purchased by drug growers.
9. Would increased early aerial surveillance and early interdiction be more effective than the late summer efforts that are currently being made?
10. Would establishment and enforcement of drug free zone (zones where vigorous enforcement would take place) around towns and parks in northern California be an effective strategy?
11. Could a data base of the locations of illegal gardens be established from which, overtime, we might learn something about the forest geography of the locations being used to grow marijuana?
12. Could surveillance cameras be installed on forest roads suspected as being used to supply the people tending the gardens?
13. Can a more effective reporting system be developed for professional foresters and others who work in the forest to report illegal gardens and other signs of possible illegal activities related to drug growing?

---

**RULE DEVELOPMENT PHASE****0326.6**

(3-12 months before 45 day notice proposal)

1. Define the need for a rule.
  - a. Problems
  - b. Issues
  - c. Goals
2. Staff and/or the Research and Science Committee will review or direct the review of pertinent literature and scientific information.
  - a. Gray literature.
  - b. Peer-reviewed.
  - c. Regulatory programs, planning documents and other information.
  - d. Develop the standards of significant impacts
3. Summarize and synthesize information.
  - a. Abstracts
  - b. Compare and contrast information sources.
  - c. Clarify the problem and develop the scope
4. Develop the factual record.
  - a. Defined areas of strong and weak agreement.
  - b. Verify the need for a rule
  - c. Future research needs.
  - d. Develops a basis for rule structure.
  - e. Review alternatives to rule (education, BMPs, monitoring)
  - f. Assess economic and fiscal impact
5. Develop guidance for rule development
  - a. Clear problem statement
  - b. Well-defined science and policy.
  - c. Standards for determining adequate measures to prevent or reduce impacts or restore I resources.
6. Develop Draft Rule Language
  - a. Clarity
  - b. Enforceability
  - c. Consistency with existing rules
  - d. Regional application
7. Hold stakeholder workshops for public and Agency participation in rule development
  - a. This step may need to occur earlier in the development process or more than once for complex regulations.
8. Finalize rule package, begin flowchart timelines.